



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/816,179	03/23/2001	Jeffrey Alan Meaden		7594
7:	590 04/20/2004		EXAM	INER
Gero G. McClellan			RIMELL, SAMUEL G	
Thomason, Moser & Patterson, L.L.P. Suite 1500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3040 Post Oak Boulevard Houston, TX 77056-6582			2175	C
			DATE MAILED: 04/20/2004	, 8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

£.	→					
•		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
. —		09/816,179	MEADEN, JEFFREY ALAN			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Sam Rimell	2175			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apports.	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SH THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. a period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl or period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
′—	•	— s action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. Claim(s) 10-24 is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1,2,5 and 7 is/are rejected. Claim(s) 3, 4, 6, 8, 9 is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers					
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine The specification is objected to be specification to the specification is objected to by the Examine The specification is objected to be specification to the specification is objected to be specification.	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Settion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority i	under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•				
12)[a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	es have been received. Es have been received in Application rity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage			
Attachmen	ot(s)					
2) Notice 3) Information	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 09/816,179

Art Unit: 2175

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Baisley (U.S. Patent 6,502,112).

Claim 1: Baisley discloses a method which involves the sorting of two document. The content of each document is readable as a list, given that the claims do not define what the list actually contains. A processing system compares each of the documents, with comparison involving a sorting steps 22 or 26 performed on each document.

The documents are not sortable in their default format by reason that they must be parsed at steps 21 and 25. Therefore, the data retrieval method is a specific data retrieval method that involves parsing the documents form their default format in to a secondary format (in this case, a semantical graph). Following the specific data retrieval method of receiving and parsing the document, the content of the parsed document is then sorted at steps 22 or 26.

The step of calling a generic data retrieval method if the data items are sortable in their default format is recited as a conditional step, and is thus not necessarily limiting the claim.

<u>Claim 2:</u> The specific data retrieval method involves parsing the default documents 20 and 24 into a secondary format (a semantical graph) which permits the document to be sorted at steps 22 and 26.

Application/Control Number: 09/816,179

Art Unit: 2175

Claim 5: Since the generic data retrieval method is recited as conditional, it is not

necessarily limiting of the invention. Claim 5, like claim 1, asserts that the generic data retrieval

method is conditional and not mandatory.

Claim 7: The sort/reorder functions 22 and 26 requests the data items in their sortable

format, which is the parsed format, and is different from their original unparsed format.

Claims 3, 4, 6, 8 and 9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but

would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base

claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 10-24 are allowed.

Remarks

Applicant's arguments and amendments have been considered.

Applicant argues that the two calling steps which are set forth in claim 1 are "binary

options" and that both must be demonstrated in the prior art.

Examiner does agree that the calling options are "binary" in the sense that at least one of

the two options must be exercised. However, Examiner does not agree that both must be

demonstrated in the prior art.

A critical consideration is the fact that the claimed invention is a set of method steps. The

two calling steps are diametrically opposite method steps that only occur under diametrically

opposite conditions. Both calling steps cannot occur at the same time, so that invention cannot be

logically composed of both calling steps. One of the steps must therefore be optional. The prior

art is only required to show steps that are mandatory and not steps that are optional.

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 09/816,179

Art Unit: 2175

Page 4

Accordingly, if the prior art demonstrates one of the two opposing, optional steps, it is considered anticipatory to those steps.

This action is made non-final.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Sam Rimell at telephone number (703) 306-5626.

Sam Rimell Primary Examiner Art Unit 2175